

CI 626 D Weber

First name: Dane

Last name: Weber

Q1:

A new framework should be developed.

Q2:

The framework should take a technology-neutral approach and should be industry-lead, such as with the ESRB in the United States. For games as an example, people must submit their works for classification to a government board. This is obviously costly, and well out-of-bounds for people who make 99c games to share with others.

Q3:

Yes, for the simple fact that how content is accessed affects the practicality of classification. As stated, if one wishes to make a 99c game to be played on phones, how can the costs of such classification be justified without discouraging the industry? Online content is another example: some things are simply beyond any useful classification, such as online gaming involving strong social aspects.

Q4:

If, and only if, the Australian Government proceeds with government classification, requiring classification upon complaint seems to be the only option for opening up the ability for creators of content to disseminate their material without costing an arm and a leg. Ideally, this should be industry-lead with government guidelines so classification can be a speedy, almost costless process.

Q5:

Q6:

No, not if the classification is industry-lead.

Q7:

Only for consumer advice. It is then up to people to decide for themselves whether to see it instead of having others' opinions on classification forced on them.

Q8:

No. As a musician myself, my entire desire to share my music for free would be completely annihilated if I had to submit my cheap, almost no-string budget home-made music for classification before I could share it or even offer 99c for it.

Let's not also forget the utter and complete absurdity of classifying instrumental music: no-one wants to see a repeat of Link Wray's instrumental 'Rumble' being refused classification for inciting juvenile delinquency due to its dirty sound.

Q9:

Only in regards to people under 18.

Q10:

Classification should be to inform. It should not matter how it is accessed. Content can be accessed in both ways.

Q11:

Q12:

There is no effective method of control. A few seconds on Google will completely circumvent any and all attempts to restrict content.

Q13:

Parental education. Parents should have access to home filters if they so choose, and should have access to information on how to restrict access for their children.

Q14:

Identification ensuring that the purchaser is over eighteen years old. What else can there be except complete censorship?

Q15:

Ideally, all the time so people can be properly informed.

Q16:

Government, generally considered as representing the people, should produce guidelines that do not require the obscene unanimity of the executive (i.e. Attorneys-General). Industry bodies, dealing with the content 24/7, are in the best position to follow the guidelines and apply classifications themselves. This leaves the Classification Board with the much reduced job of handling complaints and readjusting classification if found to not be in line with guidelines. The user's role is simply to be educated and have access to information to help them decide what to choose.

Q17:

Yes. As said above, the government, representing the people, is in a prime position to produce guidelines on how content should be classified. Industry is then in a prime position to apply those classifications in harmony with the guidelines. The Classification Board can then handle complaints and adjust erroneous classifications and, I dunno, maybe fine those who recklessly disregard the guidelines and apply obscenely inaccurate classifications?

Q18:

Everything, because the industry itself, creating this content, is in the best position to judge what it contains.

Q19:

As said before, government classification should only be a review process to adjust erroneous classifications if the matter is raised.

Q20:

No. The difference between M and MA15+ are confusing, and the complete lack of R18+ for video games is obscene. I have followed this issue closely for the last two years, and the difference between M and MA15+ are still confusing. The lack of R18+ already has had a personal effect on me: despite the obvious lack of legal access to adult content, I have had to advise my own friends and family on the suitability of video games. Because R18+ does not exist for video games, the classification system has failed: I then become the classifier and prevent MA15+ games, that should really be R18+, landing in the hands of my child relatives. My relatives have no way else of knowing: they cannot trust the classification scheme, they must consult me first.

Q21:

As said before, a technology-neutral framework approach should be adopted, and should be universal. That means that an R18+ category, at least, should be introduced for video games so the

average gamer (around age 30, and over half the population) can have access to adult content like every other country.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes, into a single set of guidelines for industry to follow.

Q24:

Any material that would be illegal to access regardless of classification. I.e., child abuse material. There is no need to have the classification system muddy up the waters of content that is already criminal to possess.

Q25:

No. The refused classification category is useless. If something is criminal to possess, it makes no sense to classify it.

Q26:

Yes. It would be obscene to legally have content in one state, just to hop a border and become a criminal. A national set of classification guidelines for industry would be ideal.

Q27:

As said, a national set of classification guidelines that require industry to self-regulate classification, but also provides an appeal process to the classification board if a classification is erroneously applied.

Q28:

In the interests of efficiency, if a framework that I have proposed is able to be justified under a constitutional head of power, I see every reason to pursue it.

Q29:

I cannot stress this enough: government guidelines, industry classification, and classification board appeals.

Other comments:

I am just a poor law student and musician, but I can readily see how outright ineffective the current classification system is. The games industry is, from my recollection, worth more than both the music and film industry combined. One game alone can bring in hundreds of millions of dollars, and for Australia to miss out on this because of our classification system not recognising the majority of gamers as the responsible adults they are, our economy is taking a massive hit, especially for our own budding developers. Prohibitive costs in classification for making simple 99c games ruins the chances of most people to get their works out there.